



Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council



Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2015

The Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council meeting was held on Monday, June 22, 2015 at the Department of Legislative Services Building, 90 State Circle, Annapolis, Maryland, 21401. This meeting was called to order at 2:12 PM by Christopher Shank, Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP), who presides as the Chairman for the Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council (the Council). This meeting was attended by the following Council members: Christopher Shank, GOCCP; Secretary Sam Abed, Department of Juvenile Services (DJS); Caryn Aslan, Job Opportunities Task Force (JOTF); Delegate Erek Barron; Sheriff Troy Berry, Charles County Sheriff's Office; LaMonte Cooke, Queen Anne's County Detention Center; Paul DeWolfe, Office of the Public Defender (OPD); Delegate Kathleen Dumais; David Eppler, Attorney General's Office; Robert Green, Montgomery County Department of Correction and Rehabilitation; Senator Michael Hough; Delegate Michael Malone; Senator Nathaniel McFadden; Honorable Joseph Murphy, Maryland Court of Appeals (Ret.); Senator Douglas Peters; Judy Sachwald, Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS); Scott Shellenberger, Baltimore County State's Attorney's Office; Delegate Geraldine Valentino-Smith; and Senator Robert (Bobby) Zirkin.

This meeting was also attended by multiple guests to include: Lauren Abramson, Community Conferencing Center; Kim Barranco, Baltimore City Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC); Elizabeth Bayley, Judicial Proceedings Committee; Tammy Brown, Baltimore City State's Attorney's Office; Tia Brunson, DPSCS; Philip Caroom, Maryland Alliance for Justice Reform; Molly Cioffi, GOCCP; Steve DeBoy, Governor's Legislative Office; Hannah Dier, Department of Legislative Services (DLS); Ricardo Flores, OPD; Don Hogan, GOCCP; Sarah Hoyt, Judicial Proceedings Committee; Carly Hviding, Governor's Legislative Office; Wendell France, DPSCS; Rebecca Gardner Rhady, MAJR; Lea Green, Maryland CURE; Darienne Gutierrez, Pew Charitable Trusts; Rachel Kesselman, GOCCP; Lisa Klingensmaier, Maryland Alliance for the Poor; Les Knapp, Maryland Association of Counties; Dorothy Lennig, House of Ruth; Jerry McLaurin, People for Change Coalition; Natasha Mehu, Maryland Association of Counties; Secretary Stephen Moyer, DPSCS; Russell Neverdon, DPSCS; Kelley O'Connor, Maryland Judiciary; Suanne Pelz, Maryland Judiciary; Casey Pfeifer, Pew Charitable Trusts; Shirleen Pilgrim, DLS; Sandra Pruitt, People for Change Coalition; Felicity Rose, Crime and Justice Institute; Claire Rossmark, DLS; Bob Rhudy, MAJR; Matt Schmid, Department of Budget and Management (DBM); Julie Schneide, Office of Delegate Kathleen Dumais; Drew Snyder, Maryland Judiciary; Cara Sullivan, GOCCP; Pamela Tenemaza, Public Policy Partners; Barbara Thomas, MAJR; Betsy Fox Tolentino, DJS; Zoe Towns, Pew Charitable Trusts; Jene Traore, University of Baltimore; Connie Utada, Pew Charitable Trusts; Maurice Vann, City University of New York; Cornelius Woodson Sr., DPSCS; and Jeffrey Zuback, GOCCP. A sign-in sheet was circulated to maintain a record of attendance.

I. Welcome and Introductions

This meeting was called to order at 2:12 PM by Mr. Shank as he welcomed everyone to the Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council "kick off" meeting. Mr. Shank thanked the three branches of government, as well as the agencies committed to the JRI process. The packet of information, which was received by the Council members and guests, was briefly discussed, as well the recently signed letter requesting technical assistance from The Pew Charitable Trusts, Public Safety Performance Project (PSP). Mr. Shank briefly discussed the agenda for the meeting which would include introductions of



Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council



each Council Member, an overview of Senate Bill 602, and a presentation by The Pew Charitable Trusts. Introductions were made by present Council members; 19 of the 21 members were in attendance.

II. Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council Background

Mr. Shank provided an overview of Maryland's prison and crime rates over the past five years, followed by the rate of recidivism and purpose of Senate Bill 602. The State of Maryland's state prison population has decreased by 10% over the past ten years and the recidivism rate is approximately 40%. Although Maryland has reduced the state prison population, the budget for corrections continues to rise. Because of this, the State of Maryland passed Senate Bill 602 to use a data-driven approach to reduce recidivism and reinvest averted costs. In addition, this legislation includes a partnership between the State of Maryland and The Pew Charitable Trusts to examine prison population data which will then be presented to the Council so as to develop policies.

III. Pew Charitable Trusts Presentation: Protecting Public Safety and Containing Corrections Costs in Maryland

Ms. Towns, Manager for The Pew Charitable Trusts' PSPP, provided an overview of JRI and how technical assistance is provided to various states to help develop data-driven policies to protect public safety. Typically, The Pew Charitable Trusts works with two states per year on JRI efforts – technical assistance is currently being provided to Maryland and Alaska. Approximately 36 states have achieved (or are in the process of achieving) JRI-related reforms. Ms. Towns thanked the Council members who have met with The Pew Charitable Trusts regarding this effort.

National Landscape

Ms. Utada, Senior Associate at The Pew Charitable Trusts, provided some information on national trends and examples of states that recently achieved JRI reforms. Ms. Utada stated that JRI efforts have taken place to combat the rising prison populations that started to level off (or decline slightly) in the 2000s and 2010s. Ms. Utada also mentioned that JRI has received support from both political parties and that there has been a national shift from being "tough on crime" to getting taxpayers a better public safety return on their corrections dollars.

State Examples

Mississippi and Utah were provided as two recent examples of states that have recently passed JRI reforms. In Mississippi, The Pew Charitable Trusts analyzed the state's corrections data and found numerous areas for policy reform that are projected to avert \$266 million in corrections costs over the next 10 years.

Utah is another example of a state that recently passed significant JRI reform. The Pew Charitable Trusts analyzed their corrections data and found numerous areas for policy reform that are estimated to avert over \$500 million over the next 20 years.

JRI Process

Ms. Utada also mentioned that a similar JRI process will occur in Maryland, based on the following "next steps:" (1) prison drivers; (2) system assessment; (3) research and lessons from other states; (4) policy development; and (5) final findings and recommendations.

Prison Drivers

Ms. Rose, Senior Associate for the Crime and Justice Institute, provided an overview on the process of gathering correctional population data to determine what drives the prison population. Ms. Rose also



Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council



mentioned four main “driver analysis questions” that would be examined in greater detail: (1) who is entering prison; (2) how long do offenders stay in prison; (3) who is in prison; and (4) what happens to offenders under community supervision?

Questions and Answers

The Pew Charitable Trusts completed their presentation and asked the Council if they had any questions.

Mr. Green inquired about the prison data analysis and whether it would include local and county detention center data. The Pew Charitable Trusts responded that they will include the state correctional prison data and data from Baltimore City; however, local data was not provided. Mr. Green mentioned that local data would be beneficial to include because data from Baltimore City could potentially skew the results of the overall analysis. Mr. Green also inquired about local community corrections data and whether it will be analyzed. The Pew Charitable Trusts responded that only state data will be collected.

Mr. Shellenberger agreed with Mr. Green and greatly encouraged The Pew Charitable Trusts to receive data from every jurisdiction because Baltimore City does not mirror similar “numbers” as local jails and parolees and probationers. Mr. Shellenberger also inquired about parole and probation violations and whether the data will be broken down by reason type - committing a new offense is certainly different than a missed curfew. The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that they will analyze the reason for a violation when the data are available. If data are not available, then they may review the file to obtain case notes to determine the reason for the violation.

Mr. Shank inquired about the Advisory Stakeholder Group and how it will be formed in the State of Maryland. The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that this group is a critical part of the process. In Utah, open meetings were held at various points of the process to invite practitioners, community corrections, interested advocates, etc., as well as key constituents such as victim advocates and survivors. The Pew Charitable Trusts works with Anne Seymour who is a national victim advocate at Justice Solutions and conducts a series of roundtable meetings with victim service providers to educate them on the JRI process and obtain input and feedback.

Ms. Sachwald inquired about the savings generated in Mississippi and Utah. Ms. Utada mentioned that these calculations were based on future spending that did not occur as a result of JRI (e.g., one state did not have to build another prison which saved money). The Pew Charitable Trusts also mentioned that calculations include a reduction in the prison population.

Delegate Valentino-Smith asked The Pew Charitable Trusts if any criminal history data is collected on offenders in prison, especially prior DJS contacts. The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that they are trying to link state prison admission data with Sentencing Commission data to determine an offender’s criminal history score.

Mr. DeWolfe asked if other states’ strategies included expanding alternatives to prison and developing policy decisions on what the reinvestment strategy should be. The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that the Councils in Mississippi and Utah developed strategies to determine where funds should be – for instance, expanding treatment and resources. Mr. DeWolfe also asked if The Pew Charitable Trusts will collect any pretrial jail data on the front end of the system. The Pew Charitable Trusts responded that they would like to capture pretrial data if it is available.

Sheriff Berry asked if the reduction in state prison population in any of the states has caused an increase in the population of the county jails. The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that their policy recommendations are geared to prevent the overpopulation of the jails. In fact, policies in Utah specifically focused on



Justice Reinvestment Coordinating Council



reducing the jail population. Although this process may differ from state to state, it is definitely a focus of The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Mr. Shank asked if any states that have passed significant JRI reform have had any successes with respect to public safety or recidivism. The Pew Charitable Trusts stated that Texas is a great example of a state that significantly reduced their prison population, as well as their recidivism and crime rates. Texas made revisions to parole revocations and practices, and since reforms were passed, the number of prisoners has decreased, in addition to the crime rate.

Mr. Green added that the findings of the Pretrial Commission Report should be sent to The Pew Charitable Trusts because it contains a lot of useful pretrial data.

IV. Council Calendar and Next Steps

Mr. Shank mentioned that as we move forward, set monthly meetings will be held to discuss drivers and system analyses. While there may be some absent Council members due to vacations and other commitments, Mr. Shank asked that a representative be present if the member cannot attend. Although the location for future meetings has not been determined, Mr. Shank expressed that Annapolis serves as a good centralized location. Mr. Shank also asked the Council if they have any ideas to add to the Council Listserv so that meeting announcements may be sent to a broad audience.

In closing, Mr. Shank encouraged all Council members to meet individually with The Pew Charitable Trusts if they have not done so already. The meeting adjourned at 3:19 PM.

V. Next Meeting

The next JRCC meeting will be held on Wednesday July 29, 2015 from 3:00 PM until 5:00 PM in Annapolis, Maryland in the Joint Hearing Room of the Legislative Services Building.